

**WILLIAMSBURG  
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES  
Tuesday, May 27, 2003**

**CALL TO ORDER AND ATTENDANCE**

The regular semimonthly Architectural Review Board meeting was held on Tuesday, May 27, 2003, at 6:30 p.m. in the third Floor Conference Room of the Municipal Building.

Chairman Williams called the meeting to order. Present in addition to Mr. Williams were Board members Mr. Sandbeck, Mr. Durbin, Mr. Spence, Mr. Pons, and Mr. Watson. Absent was Vice-Chairman Walker. Also present was Zoning Administrator Murphy and Zoning Officer Beck.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

Mr. Williams motioned to approve the consent agenda as presented upon the removal of **ARB #03-041** as requested by James Kammert, 108 Richmond Hill Court, to discuss the front setback.

- |                             |   |
|-----------------------------|---|
| <b>ARB #03-028</b>          | <b>Stewart/128 Indian Springs Road – Awnings – Approved.</b>  |
| <b>ARB #03-040</b>          | <b>Wilcox/2133-54 South Henry Street – Addition (deck)-<br/>Approved.</b>   |
| <b>ARB #03-042</b>          | <b>Evans/301 Capitol Landing Road – Detached Garage &amp;<br/>Exterior Changes to Dwelling (new siding and roof) –<br/>Approved.</b>            |
| <b>ARB #03-044</b>          | <b>Granger/302 ½ Harrison Avenue – Exterior Change -<br/>Screen existing porch and add wooden steps to<br/>basement on cottage) – Approved.</b> |
| <b>ARB #03-045</b>          | <b>CWF/The Cheese Shop &amp; The Fat Canary/410 West Duke<br/>of Gloucester Street – Outdoor Furniture for Restaurant-<br/>Approved.</b>        |
| <b>ARB<br/>SIGN #03-025</b> | <b>CWF/The Cheese Shop &amp; The Fat Canary/410 West Duke<br/>of Gloucester Street – Approved.</b>  |

**Recorded vote on the motion:**

Aye:	Mr. Sandbeck, Mr. Durbin, Mr. Williams, Mr. Spence, Mr. Pons, and Mr. Watson.
Nay:	None.
Absent:	Mr. Walker.
Abstain:	Mr. Sandbeck and Mr. Spence <b>ARB #03-45 &amp; Sign #03-025.</b>

## **ARCHITECTURAL PRESERVATION DISTRICT**

### **ARB #03-039 Bowe/313 South Boundary Street – Siding (Spray-On-Siding)**

Billy Wilson, Spray-on-Siding of Virginia representative, explained that spray-on-siding is dependent upon a properly cleaned and prepared surface including any necessary repairs to the existing surface, e.g. wood siding in the case at hand. Following surface preparation, a blend of resins and polymers are applied that are designed to look like fresh paint. He presented a sample of the product in a container and applied to a piece of Hardiplank siding for the Board's review and consideration and noted the following:

- There are over 1800 hundred colors to choose from with custom made colors on request.
- The material is 20mm thick when applied and cures to 10mm in thickness.
- It does not peel, crack, or fade.
- It is 10 times thicker than regular paint.
- It breathes like gortex.

After considerable discussion Board members had the following questions which were answered by the applicant.

1. What is the price difference between a regular paint job and spray-on-siding? Mr. Wilson noted spray-on-siding is about 3 times more than a regular paint job, but it is guaranteed to last as long as you own your house with the guarantee being transferable to a new owner with a fee.
2. Could the color be changed? Mr. Wilson stated spray-on-siding was permanent and would be very difficult to remove. He noted it could be painted with regular paint if a color change was needed in the future.
3. Will the product remove architectural details from the building? The Board expressed a concern that multiple applications could change the appearance of wood siding, for example. Mr. Wilson responded that because of the lengthy guarantee, he doubted that multiple applications would be a problem unless new owners wanted to change the color of a residence. In such a case, architectural details such as the bead on wood siding could be masked somewhat.

Mr. Williams motioned to approve ARB# 03-039 conditioned upon subsequent applications being approved on a case-by-case basis depending on the architectural details of the building.

**Recorded vote on the motion:**

Aye: Mr. Sandbeck, Mr. Durbin, Mr. Williams, Mr. Spence, Mr. Pons, and Mr. Watson.

Nay: None.

Absent: Mr. Walker.

Abstain: None.

**ARB #03-041 Daniels/112 Richmond Hill Court – New Single Family Dwelling**

James Kammert, 108 Richmond Hill Court, expressed his concern with the front setback of the proposed dwelling being located approximately 1.5 – 4 feet beyond the setbacks of adjacent homes which could detract from the streetscape. Mr. Kniest, the prospective Builder, noted the front setback was approximately 1.5 feet deeper than the adjacent dwellings which would not be noticeable to someone driving in the neighborhood. Board members agreed with Mr. Kniest, considering the 1.5 foot difference in the front setback compared to the size of the house and it's location on a curve. Mr. Kammert asked if it would be acceptable to ask the owners to move the dwelling in line with the existing dwellings and if such a decision required another appearance before the Architectural Review Board. Board members agreed that if the owners wished to move the dwelling in line with the existing dwellings on either side that the application would not have to return to the Board for approval.

Mr. Williams motioned to approve ARB #03-041 conditioned upon the applicant having the option to locate the dwelling in line with the existing dwelling on either side without having to return to the Board for approval.

**Recorded vote on the motion:**

Aye: Mr. Sandbeck, Mr. Durbin, Mr. Williams, Mr. Spence, Mr. Pons, and Mr. Watson.

Nay: None.

Absent: Mr. Walker.

Abstain: None.

**ARB #03-043 Lone G Inc./719 Richmond Road – Storage Shed**

Jim Dogndes presented his proposal for relocating an 8' x 12' storage shed noting the removal of the existing cedar shake siding and roof for replacement with Hardiplank siding and shingles to match the main building. Mr. Williams noted that the **Design Review Guidelines** require either the shed being located on brick piers or a brick foundation and recommended that the applicant anchor the shed. He also noted staff's recommendation to remove the cross bars from the doors. Mr. Dogndes agreed to construct the shed on brick piers and that he would like the option of installing double panel 3-0 doors to match the building or

Architectural Review Board Minutes

May 27, 2003

Page 4

reconstructing the existing door with Hardiplank siding without the cross bars on the exterior.

Mr. Pons motioned to approve ARB #03-043 conditioned upon 12" x 12" brick piers at least 6" in height with the applicant having the option of using 3-0 double doors or reconstructing the existing door with Hardiplank siding without the cross bars on the exterior.

**Recorded vote on the motion:**

Aye: Mr. Sandbeck, Mr. Durbin, Mr. Williams, Mr. Spence, Mr. Pons, and Mr. Watson.

Nay: None.

Absent: Mr. Walker.

Abstain: None.

**Minutes May 13, 2003**

The minutes were approved as presented.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

Jason L. Beck  
Zoning Officer